

Translation of the pertinent portions of an International Search Report, mailed 03/23/2004

This International Search Report comprises a total of 5 pages. Copies of the documents cited in this report are also enclosed.

3. Lack of Unity of the Invention (see Field III)

4. Regarding the title of the invention:

X the wording filed by Applicant is approved.

5. Regarding the abstract:

X the wording filed by Applicant is approved.

6. Fig. 1, as selected by the Office, is to be published with the abstract, since Applicant has not proposed a drawing figure.

Field III Remarks in Connection with the Lack of Unity of the Invention (continuation of Item 3 on page 1):

The International Searching Authority has determined that this international application contains several inventions.

see the attached page

1. Since Applicant has paid all required additional search fees, this international search report extends to all searchable claims.

Remarks regarding the protest:

The additional fees were paid by applicant under protest.

FURTHER REMARKS

The International Searching Authority has determined that this international application contains several (groups of) inventions, namely:

1. Claims 1 (1st alternative), 2 to 10

The data set contains information for the arrangement of individual proof copies.

2. Claims 1 (2nd alternative), 11

The data set contains information regarding the shape or form of individual proof copies.

3. Claim 1 (3rd alternative)

The data set contains information regarding the size of individual proof copies.

WRITTEN NOTIFICATION FROM THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

1. This Notification contains information regarding the following items:

Field No. I	Basis of the Report
Field No. IV	Lack of Unity of the Invention
Field No. V	Reasoned Determination in accordance with Rule 43bis.1 (a)(i)
Field No. VIII	Certain Remarks Regarding the International Application

Field No. I Basis of the Report

1. Regarding the **language**, the report has been prepared on the basis of the international application in the language in which it had been filed, provided nothing else is noted under this item.

Field No. IV Lack of Unity of the Invention

1. Upon a request for payment of additional fees, Applicant has

paid additional fees under protest

3. The Office is of the opinion that the requirement for unity of the invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3

has been met

4. Therefore this notification was prepared for the following portions of the international application:

all portions

Field No. V Reasoned Determination in accordance with Rule 43bis.1 (a)(i)

1. Determination

Novelty	Yes: Claims 1 to 17
	No: Claims

Inventive activities	Yes: Claims 1 to 17
	No: Claims

Commercial applicability Yes: Claims 1 to 17
 No: Claims

2. References and Explanations:

see the attached page

Field No. VIII

Certain Remarks Regarding the International
Application

The following has been noted regarding the clarity of the claims, the specification and the drawings, or regarding the questions whether the claims are supported in their totality by the specification:

see the attached page

ATTACHED PAGE

D1: DE-A-44 32 371
D2: DE-U-203 03 574
D3: EP-A 1 167 036

Re.: Item V

Document D1 discloses a method in accordance with the preambles of claim 1 and 11. The device in accordance with D1 takes a picture of an imprinted material with a camera and compares the data of the taken picture with a data set of a single proof copy stored in an image processing system. The error detection takes place at a "defined measuring location". If the checked proof copy is defective, its number, as well as its positional coordinates, are stored. The positional coordinates relating to the printed copy are determined in the course of printing, and not by a comparison of the recorded data with a stored data set, namely separately of this comparison, and are stored in the form of an addition to the information regarding the defective proof copy.

Therefore claim 1 differs from D1 in that the location of the defective proof copy is detected by a comparison of the actual data set with the desired data set. Claim 11 differs from D1 in that the defective proof copy is detected by a comparison of the recorded data set with a stored data set regarding the form of the individual proof copy.

Therefore the subject of claims 1 and 11 is novel within the meaning of Article 33(2) PCT.

It is the object of the invention to simplify an error detection process for individual proof copies. The object is attained by means of the features of the characterizing portions of claims 1 and 11. In this way the positional coordinates no longer need to be separately stored. The cited prior art does not provide one skilled in the art with any suggestion regarding these characteristics, which are essential for the differentiation.

Accordingly the subject of claims 1 and 11 is based on inventive activities within the meaning of Article 33(3) PCT.

The dependent claims represent advantageous further developments of the independent claims and also meet the requirements of Articles 33(2) and (3) PCT.

Re.: Item VIII

Claims 1 to 5, 11, are not clear within the meaning of Article 6 PCT, since it is not possible by means of the data set to determine how the data were obtained.